



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/501,259

07/09/2004

Shunichi Shiozawa

61646 (70904)

7532

21874

7590

03/10/2009

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP

P.O. BOX 55874

BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

POHNERT, STEVEN C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1634

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/10/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                                      |  |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/501,259 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>SHIOZAWA ET AL. |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b><br>STEVEN C. POHNERT | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1634                |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) STEVEN C. POHNERT. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Mark Russet. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 04 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 4 and 11.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative contacted the examiner about how best to move the instant case forward in view of enablement rejection of record. The examiner and applicant's representative agreed that a declaration may be the best approach and further conferred on issues to address in the declaration. No agreements were reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| /Steven C Pohnert/<br>Examiner, Art Unit 1634 |  |
|---|--|